



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

able development toward the conquest of the air has necessitated definite action, and will offer the first opportunity for the powers to enter into a common consideration, and, at any rate, to regain their lost position, if no more. Believe me, too, it will be in a sense *the last*; for what is decided then, or even drifted into, will finally establish the precedent that will govern the future. I appeal to you, therefore, that this urgent preparation for the Third Hague Conference be at once commenced, and that when the time comes a suitable and strong communication be addressed to the conference itself.

3. But that is not enough. Governments are notoriously dependent on and influenced by public opinion, and diplomatic delegates are under the control and direction of the governments appointing them. The people are, theoretically, the rulers, and if they are not practically, it is because they do not know how to use their power, and are divided and misled. Of the power there can be no question. War is no longer "the game of kings." No war can take place, even among the foremost nations until the democracy are carried into it by the press, and it is the business of politicians to study the varying currents of popular thought and sentiment, which they invariably do. I propose, therefore, that a united and effective appeal be made to the democracies of the world, and to this end that pacifists themselves should take up the question and study it well, that they may rise to a sense of its importance and of the danger that is imminent. The peace societies throughout the world should be invited to put it foremost in their propaganda until the final appeal to the Third Hague Conference is made. A series of powerful brochures or pamphlets, similar to "Die Barbarisierung der Luft," by the Baroness von Suttner, should be prepared, translated into all important languages, and circulated in all lands. Wherever possible a Van Mission and a system of popular lecturing should be used. The Carnegie or the Ginn Foundations, or both, should enable us to do all that is necessary, and they would be amply repaid. It is a large scheme, and it may be necessary to form a small committee to carry it through.

But what is done should be done quickly, before the use of these aerial war machines is settled, and "before great vested interests have been formed."

Armed Peace—The Burden and Folly of Europe.

By Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D.

(From the Congregationalist and Christian World.)

A distinguished general once defined war as "hell," and no one has yet ventured to question the accuracy of the definition. If war is "hell," then armed peace may perhaps be fittingly defined as "purgatory." The nations just now in fullest possession of the blessings of armed peace are not suffering the tortures of the damned, but only the torments of the place popularly supposed to lie next door to hell. In America one hears of armed peace with the hearing of the ear; when one sees it face to face, he exclaims, "The half was never told!" A few years ago I looked at it a long time from Berlin. Recently I have been looking at it from London.

AS EXPENSIVE AS WAR.

An American dropped down into this European world is surprised to find that armed peace and war have so many points in common. First of all, they are not unlike in their expensiveness. Armies and navies cost a deal of money, whether they fight or play. Men engaged in mimic battles eat as much and wear as much and shoot as often as they do in genuine warfare. When tens of thousands of men spend their days in drilling, they must be fed and clothed by the sweat and toil of others. Armed peace puts a soldier on every worker's back, just as war does. It costs even more to keep soldiers at play today than it used to cost on the battlefield.

Armed peace, like war, is tremendously exciting. It keeps the nerves a-tingling. There is a constant movement of troops, a continual shifting of ships. Strategic positions are seized and abandoned. Now, death-dealing inventions are snapped up at fabulous prices, spies are ever at work obtaining invaluable secrets. New combinations of land and naval forces present ever-changing problems. Fresh dangers emerge every day. War clouds of varying degrees of blackness flit across the sky. Terrifying rumors fly hither and thither. Alarming crises come and go, sometimes at the rate of two and three a week. Every time a battle squadron is shifted, military and naval experts set to work to calculate the possible effect on the dual *entente*, and the dual alliance, and then on the triple *entente* and the triple alliance. This is a laborious and intricate process, and weeks are sometimes consumed before a definite conclusion can be attained.

Every time a new battleship is launched, all the battleships and cruisers and destroyers of every nation are recounted, their tonnage and speed are reappraised and their comparative efficiencies are retabulated and newly discussed. Every time a governmental official passes from one country to another, a thousand pens begin to speculate and frame predictions. War furnishes rare opportunities for the wiseacre and gossip, but the opportunities offered by armed peace are immeasurably superior.

A SOURCE OF UNHEALTHY EXCITEMENT.

In war enormous space is devoted by the press to military and naval characters and operations, and the space is scarcely less in armed peace. Every paper has today its military and naval correspondents, and never have war correspondents displayed greater industry or genius than one finds in the reporters of armed peace. The literary output of these writers, both in quantity and quality, is amazing. The problems presented by armed peace seem even more numerous and fascinating than those created by war. The simple recording of the happenings of the military and naval worlds is itself sufficient to occupy the time of an army of reporters. Columns are devoted, day by day, to military and naval appointments and promotions, other columns are sacred to military and naval social functions, still other columns are filled with reports of inspections and reviews, of maneuvers and cruisers, of target practice and bomb-dropping contests, of battleship launchings and new appeals for additional battalions and squadrons.

The rattle of swords is always in one's ears. The flash of scarlet and gold is always in one's eyes. The thought of invasion and conquest is always in one's

mind. In the early autumn the papers contain little else than maps of battlefields and pictures of contending armies, and discussions of merits and defects, and the laudations of rulers and lords of the magnificent spectacle presented. The one conclusion reached by every peace-loving nation at the end of its autumnal maneuvers is that the army battalions must be increased, and that the line of fighting ships must be still further extended. This is part of the game.

BREEDING CONSTANT FEAR.

War breeds disquieting rumors and sows anxieties and fears; so also does armed peace. Dreadnaughts inspire fear in many quarters, but chiefly in the heart of the nation which builds them. No nation has so many of them as England, and no nation is in such a chronic state of trepidation. More than once in recent years England has been on the verge of hysterics. This has been the work of her military and naval experts. They have frightened some people out of their senses.

The frenzied letters which appear from day to day in the newspapers, some of them from military and naval officials, some from obscure and humble patriots, clamoring for still further increases in army and navy, and pointing out ways in which the approaching doom may be averted, bear pathetic witness to the terrorism which armed peace inspires. The work of waging war is not half so frightening as the task of maintaining an armed peace. England was never so frightened when she was fighting Spain or France or Russia as now when, surrounded by Dreadnaughts, she is keeping the peace.

Even in suffering and death armed peace and war are twin brothers. War cannot be played without multiplying graves. Aerial scouts fall and are killed. Big naval vessels run down smaller ones, and young men sink never to rise again. Submarines refuse to fulfill expectations, and precious lives are snuffed out. Guns burst on the land and magazines explode on the sea, and new names are added to the roll of the dead.

Indeed, armed peace and war are so much alike that the first is likely to pass into the second almost any day. In America there are innocent people who believe that huge armaments exist in the interest of peace. In Europe that stage of credulity has been outgrown. All far-seeing Europeans know that armed peace is the preliminary of war. The naval and military correspondents acknowledge this.

So firm is the conviction that war is inevitable that men are discussing in the newspapers the desirability of cutting a canal at enormous expense from the Clyde to the Forth for the swift transfer of battleships from one sea to another, and the necessity of establishing at once, here and there throughout England, enormous granaries for the storing of flour for the feeding of the people when the outside sources of supply are cut off. The country has been flooded with pamphlets written by military experts showing how easily England can be starved.

I feel in London just as I felt in Berlin, exceedingly amazed; amazed that Christian rulers, who call themselves defenders of the Christian faith, should take such conspicuous and jubilant interest in the work of extending and perfecting the apparatus devised for human slaughter; amazed also that the Christian statesmen of two Christian empires should lack the wisdom ade-

quate to meet humanity's most crying need at the present hour. The curious thing is that I never could find anybody in Germany who wants to fight England, and I have not been able to find in England anybody who wants to fight Germany. Nobody wants to fight, and yet there goes up this shrill and constant cry for more guns. Just where the cry comes from, and why it is so vigorous and persistent, is the first problem which the Carnegie Peace Foundation would do well to consider.

There are sundry things now hidden which ought to be revealed. The most elaborate and demoralizing foolery extant is the armed peace of Christendom. A mighty effort is just now on foot to suck the English colonies into the wild vortex, and this means the tightening of the bonds between all German-speaking States. The Old World, debilitated by her folly, would now draw on the resources of the New. At the very time when new lands are most in need of plowshares and pruning hooks they are urged to beat them into swords and spears. There is no prayer which an American needs to pray more fervently or more often than, "From the crowding horrors of an armed peace, good Lord, deliver us!"

LONDON, Oct. 10, 1912.

The Cost of Militarism.

Sir John Brunner, president of the National Liberal Federation, at the middle of October addressed a letter on foreign policy to the chairmen of the Liberal Associations throughout Great Britain. The text of the letter is as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am impelled to write this letter to you by a strong feeling of responsibility. The Liberal party has been engaged during six years of office in an arduous struggle with the mighty forces of privilege, monopoly, and protection. In this short period three great general elections have been fought and won. The Budget, the Parliament bill, old-age pensions, national insurance, Home Rule, and Welsh disestablishment have absorbed all our energies. Foreign politics have not received the attention they deserve. But the Morocco crisis of last year and the warlike concentration of fleets in the North Sea, which excited so much apprehension, have opened the eyes of the sleepest politicians to a new and pressing danger. Every one now sees that prosperity and progress at home are bound up with the cause of international peace. Armaments and war spell poverty and ruin. The great Liberal victory of 1906 was won on a programme of peace, retrenchment and reform. Conciliation in South Africa seemed to usher in a policy of friendliness and good-will which would be followed by a wide extension of international law, and a general happy reduction in the burden of armaments. We can still say with thankfulness that Great Britain has remained at peace during the whole period of Liberal rule—a happy contrast with the previous ten years of Unionist administration, which promoted a dozen wars in different parts of the empire. Moreover, while Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman lived there was some relaxation in the growth of military and naval expenditure, though by no means in proportion to the legitimate expectations of the party.